

From: [Jay Field](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); rgensemer@parametrix.com; [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: Re: Bioassay Interpretation at Portland Harbor
Date: 06/08/2009 11:03 AM

Eric,
before we talk with John, I think we should request a table from LWG with raw values, control-adjusted values, significance, and tox level classification. Without knowing what the discrepancies are, I'm not sure what we would accomplish by having a discussion. Also, I would like some more clarification on item #3, calculation of hit level. We used the reference envelope value (REV) and 90%, 80%, and 70% of that value to determine the thresholds. (all values are control-adjusted values). this is the same as subtracting 10% of the REV from the REV, but avoids potential compounding rounding errors.

I'm available most of this week except Thursday.

Jay

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

At the AOPC meeting, it became apparent that our interpretation of the sediment bioassay results did not match the LWG's interpretation. I am interested in understanding the basis for this discrepancy. Based on my review of the data, the bioassay results match up with the bins that we established in Table RE-2 in our March 31, 2009 direction to LWG (see previous email). Last week, I put in a call to John Toll to try to understand the LWG's interpretation. Although I did not speak directly with John, he left me a voice mail that described 3 possibilities for the discrepancy:

- 1) The raw response rates differ slightly - e.g., 15% vs. 17%. John does not know why this is the case.
- 2) Significance Testing. The LWG used the biostats software. He indicated that this is a complicated procedure but that the LWG followed the decision tree associated with the software package and did not make any choices that were inconsistent with the decision tree.
- 3) The calculation of the level of the hit (e.g., low, moderate or severe toxicity) based on a comparison to the reference envelope was based on an added 10% to the reference envelop opposed to multiplying by the reference envelope value by 1.1 or 1.2.

I would like to set up a time to discuss this sometime this week. Please let me know when you might be available. I will work with John to hopefully have some information that we can use to focus the discussion.

Thanks, Eric,

--

Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE

Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov